

A KING'S CHARTER WHICH REFUSES TO DIE

JULY 20, 1998

By James Montgomery

I would like to start by thanking Pete Stern and the Informer for their continued research and dedication to the American people. Pete deserves special thanks for finding an annotated copy of the Definitive 1783 Treaty of Peace, wherein he found reference to the Supreme Court case, The Society for Propagating the Gospel &c v. New Haven, 8 Wheat. 464; 5 Cond. Rep. 489. I will quote from the this case and the Chamberlin case below.

The Newhaven case is a true God send, it totally confirms the Informer's and my research findings concerning our being subjects bearing financial obligation for the debt owed to the king of England and his heirs and successors, as well as the main party of interest, the Pope. Which confirms what I said in "The United States Is Still A British Colony" about the following quotes.

"YIELDING AND PAYING yearly, to us, our heirs and Successors, for the same, the yearly Rent of Twenty Marks of Lawful money of England, at the Feast of All Saints, yearly, forever, The First payment thereof to begin and be made on the Feast of All Saints which shall be in the year of Our Lord One thousand six hundred Sixty and five; AND also, the fourth part of all Gold and Silver Ore which, with the limits aforesaid, shall, from time to time, happen to be found." (Feast of All Saints occurred November 1 of each year.) The Carolina Charter, 1663

"And provided further, that nothing herein contained shall affect the titles or possessions of individuals holding or claiming under the laws heretofore in force, or grants heretofore made by the late King George II, or his predecessors, or the late lords proprietors, or any of them." Declaration of Rights 1776, North Carolina Constitution

I have been declaring this in spite of being slammed by pro constitutionalist patriots, who refuse to accept the facts. The king is still head of America Inc., the author of its Charters, and the creator of his cestui que trust. The king continues to be the benefactor along with his heirs and successors of the largest corporation in the history of the world. The Pope as well is co benefactor with the king, thanks to the king's concessions of May 15, 1213 to the Pope.

"We wish it to be known to all of you, through this our charter, furnished with our seal, that inasmuch as we had offended in many ways God and our mother the holy church, and in consequence are known to have very much needed the divine mercy, and can not offer anything worthy for making due satisfaction to God and to the church unless we humiliate ourselves and our kingdoms: we, wishing to humiliate ourselves for Him who humiliated Himself for us unto death, the grace of the Holy Spirit inspiring, not induced by force or compelled by fear, but of our own good and spontaneous will and by the common counsel of our barons, do offer and freely concede to God and His holy apostles Peter and Paul and to our mother the holy Roman church, and to our lord pope Innocent and to his Catholic successors, the whole kingdom of England and the whole kingdom Ireland, with all their rights and appurtenances, for the remission of our own sins and of those of our whole race as well for the living as for the dead; and now receiving and holding them, as it were a vassal, from God and the Roman church, in the presence of that prudent man Pandulph, subdeacon and of the household of the lord pope, we perform and swear fealty for them to him our aforesaid lord pope Innocent, and his catholic successors and the Roman church, according to the form appended; and in the presence of the lord pope, if we shall be able to come before him, we shall do liege homage to him;

binding our successors aid our heirs by our wife forever, in similar manner to perform fealty and show homage to him who shall be chief pontiff at that time, and to the Roman church without demur. Concessions of May 15, 1213 to the Pope

The states and its inhabitants claim this land as theirs, patriots claim they have allodial title to the land. How can this be when they never owned it to begin with?

"But this State had no title to the territory prior to the title of the King of Great Britain and his subjects, nor did it ever claim as lord paramount to them. This State was not the original grantor to them, nor did they ever hold by any kind of tenure under the State, or owe it any allegiance or other duties to which an escheat is annexed. How then can it be said that the lands in this case naturally result back by a kind of reversion to this State, to a source from whence it never issued, and from tenants who never held under it? MARSHALL v. LOVELESS, 1 N.C. 412 (1801), 2 S.A. 70

The world continues to pay the benefactors of the king's Charters, for the king's investment in America, via taxes. I have got news for you America, if Conquest, war or the dividing of an Empire cannot pry the possessions from a Corporate trust, the king never lost or was in danger of losing his possessions. Also, the king's money that was in existence and being used by the states and their inhabitants, prior to the Revolutionary War, remained the king's possessions, real property, on loan to America and her inhabitants, for which the king expected and demanded his return for his investment, under his corporate Charters and the trust he set up for his heirs and successors. Was this the only money infusion into this Country? No. Beginning in 1778, just two years after the Revolutionary War began, the states were borrowing money from the king of France. The House of Rothschilds located in France was the money source. France (Rothschilds) continued to loan money to the U.S. government with the debt reaching 18 million dollars. This is the foot hold Hamilton had over Washington during the debate on whether or not to allow the banking families to incorporate in the U.S., and float this country's debt. You don't have to be a rocket scientist to figure it out, look back at what has happened since and you will see this is in fact what took place.

Seems to me as a matter of law, a contract entered into voluntarily by someone voids any conflict or injury to that individual's rights. The king always intended to retain his minerals and money, and he knew as stated by other quotes in this article the barristers would retain his land under the corporate trust.

Contract Between the King and the Thirteen United States of North America, signed at Versailles July 16, 1782.

ARTICLE 1

"It is agreed and certified that the sums advanced by His Majesty to the Congress of the United States under the title of a loan, in the years 1778, 1779, 1780, 1781, and the present 1782, amount to the sum of eighteen million of livres, money of France, according to the following twenty-one receipts of the above-mentioned underwritten Minister of Congress, given in virtue of his full powers, to wit:

1. 28 February 1778 750,000
2. 19 May do 750,000
3. 3 August do 750,000
4. 1 November do 750,000

Total 3,000,000

- 5. 10 June 1779 250,000
- 6. 16 September do 250,000
- 7. 4 October do 250,000
- 8. 21 December do 250,000
 - Total 1,000,000
- 9. 29 February 1780 750,000
- 10. 23 May do 750,000
- 11. 21 June do 750,000
- 12. 5 October do 750,000
- 13. 27 November do 1,000,000
 - Total 4,000,000
- 14. 15 February 1781 750,000
- 15. 15 May do 750,000
- 16. 15 August do 750,000
- 17. 1 August do 1,000,000
- 18. 15 November do 750,000
 - Total 4,000,000
- 19. 10 April 1782 1,500,000
- 20. 1 July do 1,500,000
- 21. 5 of the same month 3,000,000
 - Total 6,000,000

Amounting in the whole to eighteen millions, viz 18,000,000.

By which receipts the said Minister has promised, in the name of Congress and in behalf of the thirteen United States, to cause to be paid and reimbursed to the royal treasury of His Majesty, on the 1st of January, 1788, at the house of his Grand Bunker at Paris, the said sum of eighteen millions, money of France, with interest at five per cent per annum."

Source: Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America. Edited by Hunter Miller Volume 2 Documents 1-40 : 1776-1818 Washington : Government Printing Office, 1931.

Notice also folks, this is just one year before the 1783 Treaty of Peace is signed, the king of France (Rothschilds) made sure his debt was protected before he signed on to the con of the millennium. The king of England's Charter on one side, the Rothschild's debt obligations on the other, both vying for a piece of America. The king of England for his trust, the Rothschilds for their corporate take over and control of the king's trust, the Pope as the main benefactor of both sides. The Pope remains even further in the back ground than the Rothschilds, however he stands to gain no matter what happens.

Here are a few quotes from William Manley German, in a speech to the House of Commons December 1913.

"....Referring to Canada's bank acts: I believe the plan outlined follows the English system, a system applied to the great banks of England. Mr. White, House of Commons, December 17, 1912, in response to a question from the Honorable William Manley German. i.e. they were creating an English system which is to say a Rothschildian cartel...."

"Senator Robert L. Owen continues: "It was not very long until this information was brought to the

Rothschild's Bank, and they saw that here was a nation ready to be exploited; here was a nation setting up an example that they could issue their own money instead of the money coming through the banks"

"The Rothschild's Bank caused a bill to be introduced in the English Parliament, which provided that no colony of England could issue its own money."

"Thus, they had to use English money. The colonies were compelled to discard their money and mortgage themselves to the Rothchild's Bank of England to get money."

"Then, for the first time in the history of the United States, money began to be based on debt. Benjamin Franklin stated that in one year from that date the streets of the colonies were filled with the unemployed."

"Franklin later claimed that this was the real cause of the War of Independence. He said: "The colonies would gladly have borne the little tax on tea and other matters had it not been that England and the Rothschild's Bank took away from the colonies their money which created unemployment, dissatisfaction and debt." William Manley German, in a speech to the House of Commons December 1913, Brigham Young University, web site <Http://library.byu.edu/~rdh/eurodocs/uk.html>.

Nothing changes, the Rothschilds have always played both sides against each other, they did the same thing during the Civil War, see my research paper, "A Country Defeated In Victory, parts I & II.

Before I go any further lets look at the facts that prove the king never lost his Corporations created by his Charters, or lands held by his Corporations, by and through the supposed loss of the Revolutionary War, or the signing of the 1783 Treaty of Peace, or the 1794 Jay Treaty.

"The property of British corporations, in this country, is protected by the sixth article of the treaty of peace of 1783, in the same manner as those of natural persons; and their title, thus protected, it confirmed by the ninth article of the treaty of 1794, so that it could not be forfeited by any intermediate legislative act, or other proceeding for the defect of alienage." The Society for Propagating the Gospel, &c v. New Haven, 8 Wheat. 464; 5 Cond. Rep. 489. (Footnote-annotated, Definitive Treaty of Peace)

"The capacity of private individuals (British subjects), or of corporations, created by the crown, in this country, or in Great Britain, to hold lands or other property in this country, WAS NOT affected by the revolution. The proper courts in this country will-interfere to prevent an abuse of the trusts confided to British corporations holding lands here to charitable uses, and will aid in enforcing the due execution of the trusts; but neither those courts, nor the local legislature where the lands lie, can adjudge a forfeiture of the franchises of the foreign corporation, or of its property. The property of British corporations, in this country, is protected by the 6th article of the treaty of peace of 1783 in the same manner as those of natural persons; and their title, thus protected, is confirmed by the 9th article of the treaty of 1794, so that it could not be forfeited by any intermediate legislative act, or other proceeding, for the defect of alienage. The termination of a treaty, by war, DOES NOT divest rights of property already vested under it. Nor do treaties, in general, become extinguished, ipso facto, by war between the two governments. Those stipulating for a permanent arrangement of territorial, and other national rights, are, at most, suspended during the war, and revive at the peace, unless they are waived by the parties, or new and repugnant stipulations are made." The Society, &c., v. The Town of New Haven. Et Al. 8 Wheat. 464; 5 Cond. Rep. 489.

The king holds the rest of the world to different standards, as does the Pope, they hold us to the king's law on trusts and does not apply the same law to himself, so he can retain his lands and possessions, as does the Pope, under British made International law.

"It is a familiar principle that the King is not bound by any act of parliament unless he be named therein by special and particular words. The most general words that can be devised (for example, any person or persons, bodies politic or corporate) affect not him in the least, if they may tend to restrain or diminish any of his rights and interests. He may even take the benefit of any particular act, though not named. The rule thus settled respecting the British Crown is equally applicable to this government, and it has been applied frequently in the different states, and practically in the Federal courts. It may be considered as settled that so much of the royal prerogatives as belonged to the King in his capacity of *parens patriae*, or universal trustee, enters as much into our political state as it does into the principles of the British Constitution." U.S. v. Chamberlin, 219 U.S. 250 (1911), "Dollar Sav. Bank v. United States, *supra*"

Do the king and the Pope have proper claims to their land holdings? No. The king's claim would not exist accept for his barristers (lawyers), his backers the bankers, the Pope, via his churches land holdings and financial backing of the early banking families. The reason I also say no, is fraud and deception are involved. How did the king come by his claim? By the Conquest of Britain by William the Conqueror in 1066, and thanks to the Pope's partnership with England as trustee for Rome, working inside of Britain with her Jesuit priests. Conquest does not change land held in trust. So the lands held by the Brits and trusts (wills of testament), and traditions of the fathers land going to the sons, could not be overturned by the Conquest of William the Conqueror. But even further than that, God Almighty granted to Adam and his descendants the entire earth, it was given away to satan, but later reclaimed by Jesus Christ as the second Adam, the land was then placed in trust for the descendants of Israel, including the lost 10 tribes. Causing the world to be ruled over by Israel and the riches of the world to be stored up for the righteous. To deny this trust and Charter is to deny the written Word of God Almighty, if the Pope denied this he would expose himself as the apostate Church (the whore) spoken of in Revelations. Why do I say this, because he and the king hold lands by the king's civil law, through creations of Trusts and Charters, over land they do not own, for they cannot. God Almighty owns the land and grants the land to whom he chooses, Israel.

Just as the king held on to his possessions after the Revolutionary War for his heirs and successors, and just as conquest does not change ownership of lands and possessions held in trust, we now have the same claim. The fraud is, the king is taxing us for a trust he created, based on an earlier conquest.

"As further evidence, not that any is needed, a percentage of taxes that are paid are to enrich the king/queen of England. For those that study Title 26 you will recognize IMF, which means Individual Master File, all tax payers have one. To read one you have to be able to break their codes using file 6209, which is about 467 pages. On your IMF you will find a blocking series, which tells you what type of tax you are paying. You will probably find a 300-399 blocking series, which 6209 says is reserved. You then look up the BMF 300-399, which is the Business Master File in 6209. You would have seen prior to 1991, this was U.S.-U.K. Tax Claims, non-refile DLN. Meaning everyone is considered a business and involved in commerce and you are being held liable for a tax via a treaty between the U.S. and the U.K., payable to the U.K.. The form that is supposed to be used for this is form 8288, FIRPTA - Foreign Investment Real Property Tax Account, you won't find many people using this form, just the 1040 form. The 8288 form can be found in the Law Enforcement Manual of the IRS, chapter 3. If you will check the OMB's paper - Office of Management and Budget, in the Department of Treasury, List of Active Information Collections, Approved Under Paperwork Reduction Act, you will find this form under OMB number 1545-0902, which says U.S. withholding

tax-return for dispositions by foreign persons of U.S. real property interests-statement of withholding on dispositions, by foreign persons, of U.S. Form #8288 #8288a. These codes have since been changed to read as follows; IMF 300-309, Barred Assement, CP 55 generated valid for MFT-30, which is the code for 1040 form. IMF 310-399 reserved, the BMF 300-309 reads the same as IMF 300-309. BMF 390-399 reads U.S./U.K. Tax Treaty Claims. The long and short of it is nothing changed, the government just made it plainer, the 1040 is the payment of a foreign tax to the king/queen of England. We have been in financial servitude since the Treaty of 1783. The United States Is Still A British Colony, part I

It's a big con. Only God Almighty owns the land, by grant and charter, also trust, the land is reserved for us and our use, the benefactors of his kingdom and covenant. How can you take that which does not belong to you? By force of arms, that is why Jesus Christ with his angels will take by Conquest what belongs to Him and His Heirs, see Matthew chapter 13. We can prove our title and possession of the land, which predates any other claim. It is a shame we could not have learned from the American Indian, that no man owns the land.

"....In Harden v Fisher, 1 Wheat Rep. 300, which was also under the treaty of 1794, this court held that it was not necessary for the party to show a seisin in fact, or actual possession of the land, but only that the title was in him, or his ancestors, at the time the treaty was made...." The Society, &c., v. The Town of New Haven. Et Al. 8 Wheat. 464; 5 Cond. Rep. 489.

"....In Terrett v. Taylor, it was stated that the dissolution of the regal government, no more destroyed the rights of the church to possess and enjoy the property which belonged to it, than it did the right of any other corporation or individual to his or its own property. In the later case, the Chief Justice, in reference to the corporation of the college, observes that it is too clear to require the support of argument, that all contracts and rights respecting property remained unchanged by the revolution; and the same sentiment was enforce, more at length, by the other judge who noticed this point in the cause...." The Society, &c., v. The Town of New Haven. Et Al. 8 Wheat. 464; 5 Cond. Rep. 489.

As a matter of law these treaties were written in such away they could not be overturned using civil law, so the Revolutionary War changed nothing concerning the king's investment and creation of America Inc.

"....His lordship observes that that was a case in which the old government existed under the King's charter, and a revolution took place, though the new government was acknowledged by this country. Yet it was held, that the property, which belonged to a corporation existing under the King's charter, was not transferred to a body which did not exist under his authority, and, therefore, the fund in this country was considered to be bona vacantia belonging to the crown...." The Society, &c., v. The Town of New Haven. Et Al. 8 Wheat. 464; 5 Cond. Rep. 489.

"....The treaty of 1783 forbids all forfeitures on either side. That of 1794 provides that the citizens and subjects of both nations, holding lands (thereby strongly implying that there were no forfeitures by the revolution), shall continue to hold, according to the tenure of their estates; that they may sell and devise them; and shall not, so far as respects these lands and the legal remedies to obtain them, be considered as aliens. In the case Kelly v. Harrison, 2 Johns. cas 29., Mr. Chief Justice Kent says: " I admit the doctrine to be sound (Calvin's case, 7 Co. 27 b.; Kirby's Rep. 413), that the division of an empire works no forfeiture of a right previously acquired. The revolution left the demandant where she was before...." The Society, &c., v. The Town of New Haven. Et Al. 8 Wheat. 464; 5 Cond. Rep. 489.

I remind America what Edmond Burke said:

"....Let the colonies always keep the idea of their civil rights associated with you government-they will cling and grapple to you, and no force under heaven will be of power to tear them from their allegiance. But let it be once understood that your government may be one thing and their privileges another, that these two things may exist without any mutual relation - the cement is gone, the cohesion is loosened, and everything hastens to decay and dissolution. As long as you have the wisdom to keep the sovereign authority of this country as the sanctuary of liberty, the sacred temple consecrated to our common faith, wherever the chosen race and sons of England worship freedom, they will turn their faces towards you. The more they multiply, the more friends you will have, the more ardently they love liberty, the more perfect will be their obedience. Slavery they can have they may have it from Spain, they may have it from Prussia. But until you become lost to all feeling of your true interest and your natural dignity, freedom they can have from none but you. This commodity of price, of which you have the monopoly. This is the true Act of Navigation, which binds to you the commerce of the -colonies, and through them secures to you the wealth of the world. Deny them this participation of freedom, and you break that sole bond which originally made, and must still preserve, the unity of the empire....Let us get an American revenue as we have got an American empire. English privileges have made it all that it is; English privileges alone will make it all it can be." Edmund Burke, speech on conciliation with America, pages 71-72, March 22, 1775, web site, [wysiwyg://54/http://odur.let.rug.nl/%7Eusa/D/1751-1775/libertydebate/burk.htm](http://odur.let.rug.nl/%7Eusa/D/1751-1775/libertydebate/burk.htm).

America what about "you have been conned" do you not understand? What will it take for you to wake up?

James Montgomery

AMERICAN PATRIOT NETWORK